

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner's rejection is fully traversed below for the following reasons:

(a) Schneier et al. does not teach or suggest: creating a player tracking account for a player using player information derived from an account card associated with the player

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that *Schneier et al.* Teaches creating a player tracking account for a player by using information derived from an account card associated with a player, wherein the account card corresponds to a remote account unrelated to a player tracking system. To support this assertion, the Examiner has relied on Column 4, lines 51-64 and Column 5, lines 10-59 of *Schneier et al.* (Final Office Action, page 2).

It is noted that *Schneier et al.* states:

Player database 255 maintains data on players, and includes fields such as name, address, credit card number, phone number, ID number, social security number, electronic mail address, past system usage, public/private key information, and game preferences. This information is preferably obtained when the player first registers with the system. Player database 255 also contains the tracking number of each player selection data and player random number generated by a player. [Col. 5, lines 14-22 of *Schneier et al.*]

Clearly, obtaining a name, address, credit card number, phone number, ID number, social security number, electronic mail address, past system usage, public/private key information, or game preferences does not teach or even remotely suggest creating a player tracking account using information derived from an account card. This distinction is apparent because *Schneier et al.* merely teaches that player information can be obtained when a player first registers. However, *Schneier et al.* does NOT teach or even remotely suggest using player information to create a player tracking account. In other words, *Schneier et al.* does NOT teach or even remotely suggest using player information to create a player tracking account. In fact, *Schneier et al.* does not even address creating a player tracking account. Rather, *Schneier et al.* teaches that:

“A system for playing electronic games includes a game server and one or more player terminals. Game results are based on a random number generated in each of the game server and the player terminals. The game server and the player terminals cooperate to ensure that the random numbers are generated independently. As a result, game players and the game host, such as a casino, can be confident that play results are not fraudulent. In one embodiment, the random numbers are transmitted between the game server and the player terminals at substantially the same time. In other embodiments, the random numbers are encoded and exchanged between the game server and the player terminals. Then, keys to decode the random numbers are exchanged.” [Schneier *et al.*, *Abstract*]

(b) Neither *Schneier et al.* nor *Ramachandran et al.* teach or suggest allowing a player to be registered with a player tracking system without requiring the player to specify the player information used to create the player tracking account

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that it is known in the art to obtain information from a card without requiring a user to specify the information and *Ramachandran et al.* teaches a payment processing system where payment information is obtained from a bankcard using an ATM (Final Office Action, page 4).

Initially, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s assertion does not address the claimed features. More particularly, the Examiner needs to at least show a teaching for automatically deriving player information from a bankcard in order to create a player tracking account. However, the Examiner has not even asserted that such teaching is known in the art and consequently has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Clearly, reading an ATM card in itself does not teach or suggest deriving information from an account card in order to create a player tracking account.

(c) The prior art does not suggest the desirability of the claimed invention

The prior art must suggest the desirability of the claimed invention (MPEP 2143.01, I). The Examiner has not pointed to anything in the cited art that would suggest the desirability of the claimed invention. Rather, the Examiner has merely asserted that *Ramachandran et al.* can be combined with *Schneier et al.* to provide a faster means of obtaining personal information.

(d) The fact that references can be combined or the claimed invention is within the capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art is not sufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness (MPEP, 2143.01, III and IV)

Clearly, the mere assertion that user information can be directly obtained from a credit card, "thus preventing a user from performing redundant entires, and thereby providing a faster means of providing personal information thereto" does not provide a motivation or suggestion for combining the references in the first place to obtain such beneficial results.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. IGT1P070). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

/RMahboubian/
Ramin Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

November 1, 2006

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300